

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 10, as errors associated with reference numeral 1010 have been corrected. This sheet replaces the original sheet comprising Fig. 10.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1)

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 15-31 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Fig 10 depicts an item 1000, however, the specification on page 22, line 13 and page 23, line 20 describes an item 1010 (exemplary environment) instead of an item 1000. Fig. 10 has been corrected and a replacement drawing sheet is attached hereto.

II. Objection of Claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-17 and 19-28

Claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-17 and 19-28 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-17 and 19-28 lack a transition word such as wherein. For example, claim 2 recites, “the system of claim 1, the first construct.” It is suggested that the claim recites, “the system of claim 1, wherein the first construct.”

Claim 3, line 4 recites “use interface construct” instead of “user interface construct.”

Withdrawal of this objection is requested in light of the amendments to claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-17 and 19-28.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 29 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-12, 29 and 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants’ representative respectively disagrees.

Further, independent claims 1, 29 and 31 have been amended herein to clearly illustrate that elements within such claims are components associated with a computer-readable storage medium. In particular, claim 1 as amended is directed towards a system that maps a first construct of a domain to a second construct of another domain comprising *a computer-readable storage medium, comprising the following computer-executable components*, a bank and a

mapping component, wherein the *bank and the mapping component* perform a function (e.g., stores a set of suppress field labels and a set of introduce field labels and utilizes the stored labels to map the first construct to a second construct). (Support for these amendments can be found on pg. 7, lines 20-31).

Accordingly, this claim includes functional descriptive material within a computer-readable storage medium, thereby rendering it structurally and functionally interrelated to the computer-readable storage medium and is therefore directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn with regard to claims 1-12, 29 and 31.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 12-16, 18-19, 26 and 29-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-6, 12-16, 18-19, 26 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Charlet, *et al.* (US 2005/0160108). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Charlet *et al.* fails to disclose all limitations of the claimed subject matter.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that transforms constructs of different type-systems, from one domain to another domain. This enables various components in different domains to seamlessly share tasks or encapsulated business oriented information, as per the needs of the specific domain application. To that end, claim 1 recites “*A system that maps a first construct of a domain to a second construct of another domain.*” (claims 13, 18, 29, 30 and 31 recite similar features). Charlet *et al.* fails to disclose such claimed aspects.

Charlet *et al.* describes a method of passing data between an XML document and a hierarchical database, both of which have pre-defined matching hierarchical structures. With more specificity, the indexed raw data from an XML document is transferred to the database or

vice-versa, using the representations in the metadata schema for validation. The metadata here, consists of the XSD schema of the document and a database schema, thereby allowing the data of one hierarchical structure to be mapped to another hierarchical structure for the sake of transferring data under a categorized head or element name of a sub-tree.

The Examiner erroneously asserts that Charlet *et al.* substantially teaches *a system that maps a first construct of a domain to a second construct of another domain* on page 6 of the Office Action dated September 20, 2006. The cited reference provides for transfer of raw data, from an XML document classified under field names to a hierarchical database. In contrast, the claimed subject matter deals with a construct, which is an executable part of a program module or a set of declared instructions, classified under elements. As an example, the XSD schema from the markup domain, is a set of declarations with constraints that check the validity of an XML document, by defining the document's structure, content and semantics.

Claim 29

Claim 29 recites "A computer implemented signal transmitted between two or more computer components that facilitates transforming constructs, comprising: *at least one of a set of suppress field labels, a set of introduce field labels and a mediating schema that is utilized to transform a first construct to a second construct; and a component that utilizes a mapping to transform the first construct to the second construct.*" Charlet, *et al.* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such claimed aspects. Again, as stated *supra*, Charlet *et al.* is related to raw data mapping and transfer and does not teach mapping constructs.

Whereas in the claimed subject matter, additionally, structural mismatch when transforming between named and anonymous constructs of different domains is addressed. The schema bank which is be utilized to store mediating schema can be employed to generate an intermediate structure when serializing and/or deserializing constructs. The set(s) of introduce or suppress field labels is utilized to suppress the addition, modification and/or removal of constructs such that the construct can be returned to its structure of the original domain, if desired. Thus, Charlet *et al.* is silent with respect to *set of suppress field labels, a set of introduce field labels and a mediating schema that is utilized to transform a first construct to a second construct.*

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Charlet *et al.* does not teach the identical subject matter in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1, 13, 18,

29, 30 and 31 (and the claims that depend there from). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 7-8, 10 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-8, 10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlet, *et al.* (US 2005/0160108) as applied respectively to claims 6 and 19 above, and further in view of Dorsett, Jr. (US 6,658,429). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Charlet *et al.* and Dorsett, Jr. *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Dorsett, Jr. *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Charlet *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 18 (which claims 7-8, 10 and 20 respectively depend there from). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 7-8, 10 and 20 is not obvious over the combination of Charlet *et al.* and Dorsett, Jr. *et al.*, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 11 and 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlet, *et al.* (US 2005/0160108) as applied respectively to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Russell *et al.* (US 2004/0039964). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Charlet *et al.* and Russell *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Russell *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Charlet *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 18 (which claims 11 and 21-23 respectively depend there from). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 11 and 21-23 is not obvious over the combination of Charlet *et al.* and Russell *et al.*, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlet *et al.* (US 2005/0160108) as applied respectively to claims 6, 13 and 18 above, and further in view of Meltzer *et al.* (US 6,125,391). It is respectfully submitted that

this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Charlet *et al.* and Meltzer *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Meltzer *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Charlet *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 13 and 18 (which claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 respectively depend there from). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 is not obvious over the combination of Charlet *et al.* and Meltzer *et al.*, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP615US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731